REMARKS

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephonic conference on November 19, 2007, with Francis Dunn. During the conference, applicants' representative referenced proposed amendments, such as a proposed amendment to independent claim 1, to further emphasize distinctive aspects of the claimed subject matter.

Claims 1-27 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 20, 21, and 25 have been amended as shown on pages 2-7 of the Reply. No new matter has been added.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 21-24 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 21-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to comply with the written requirement. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in light of the amendment made to independent claim 21 herein.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-6, 10, 12 and 15-27 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-6, 10, 12 and 15-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doyle, *et al.* (US 2007/0130540) in view of Kraft, *et al.* (US 2005/0086217). It is requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Doyle, *et al.* and Kraft, *et al.*, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the subject claims. To reject a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a),

> the prior art reference (or references when combined) ***must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.*** *See* MPEP § 706.02(j) (emphasis added). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *See In re Vaeck,* 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The claimed subject matter relates to automatic and dynamic presentation of search result information in accordance with an adjustable viewing lens that can balance the desire to examine a plurality of search results while promoting, expanding, or highlighting information of interest within the lens. The claimed subject matter can include a lens component that can selectively animate, magnify, and/or present information within the area encompassed by the lens component ("lens area") as compared to information outside the lens area. Further, additional information (*e.g.*, textual information), which can be query-relevant information associated with a search result, can be inserted while the search result is within the lens area so that more information is displayed with regard to the search result, as compared to the amount of information displayed when the search result is outside the lens area. Thus, more detailed information can be selectively presented within the lens area while providing a balanced or minimized view of other results that remain outside the lens area.

In particular, independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claims 20 and 25), as amended, recites: a layout component that displays a detailed subset of information, comprising textual information, within the area defined by the lens component based upon the search result, ***the detailed subset of information is animated to enlarge in size and to include additional textual information that is selected from the at least one search result for insertion into the detailed subset of information based in part on a query associated with the at least one search result, as compared to the amount of information displayed for the at least one search result when outside of the area defined by the lens component***. Doyle, *et al.*, and Kraft, *et al.*, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest this distinctive feature of the claimed subject matter.

Rather, Doyle, *et al.* teaches a method for displaying a region of interest within visual information on a display screen of a computer, where the region of interest includes a focal region and a base region. (*See* p. 1, ¶ [0011]). Doyle, *et al.* teaches that detail-in-context views allow magnification of a particular region of interest in a data presentation while preserving visibility of the surrounding information. (*See* p. 3, ¶ [0028]). Doyle, *et al.* further teaches a graphical user interface (GUI) having lens control elements that can be applied to the control of the detail-in-context data presentations and that magnification of a lens is provided by the lens control element of the GUI. (*See* p. 3,

¶ [0028]; and p. 5, ¶ [0043]).

However, unlike the claimed subject matter, Doyle, *et al.* fails to teach inserting additional textual information associated with a search result when displayed within the lens area as compared to the amount of textual information provided for the search result when outside the lens area, where the additional text is determined based in part on the query for which the search result was provided. Moreover, Doyle, *et al.* is silent regarding content associated with search results. Instead, Doyle, *et al.* teaches magnifying areas of an image displayed in a focal region of a GUI. (*See* p. 3, ¶ [0029]).

Further, Kraft, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest the distinctive functionality of the claimed subject matter. Instead, Kraft, *et al.* teaches methods of summarizing a search result abstract on a client computer, locating indexable words within a search result abstract retrieved from a search engine, and dynamically generating differing levels of detail in a search result abstract on a user computer. (*See* p. 1, ¶¶ [0013]-[0015]). Kraft, *et al.* discloses a "zoom" function that can be engaged to examine a search result abstract. (*See* p. 1, ¶ [0013]). The "zoom" function can examine the search result abstract to identify indexable words (*e.g.*, key words) in a number of "search windows," while disregarding "noise" words (*e.g.*, to, the), and the indexable words selected by the "zooming" process can then be displayed to the user, with the "noise" words filtered out. (*See* p. 3, ¶ [0028]; p. 4, ¶ [0040]).

However, unlike the claimed subject matter, Kraft, *et al.* fails to teach inserting additional textual information regarding a search result when the search result is within a lens area, as compared to the amount of information displayed for the search result when not in the lens area, where the additional textual information is selected for insertion based in part on the query. Rather, Kraft, *et al.* summarizes an abstract of a search result to display indexable words and remove "noise" words, where the abstract is determined by the server site and provided with the search results. (*See* p. 1, ¶¶ [0007]-[0008]; p. 3, ¶¶ [0028]-[0029]; p. 4, ¶ [0040]). Thus, Kraft, *et al.* actually teaches removing information from an abstract of a search result provided by a server site, as opposed to providing more information regarding a search result. While Kraft, *et al.* refers to a "zoom out" of the abstract to thereby retrieve greater details of the abstract, (*See* p. 3, ¶ [0027]), such "zoom out" is ***not*** equivalent to inserting ***additional*** textual information

associated with the search result ***based in part on the query*** when displayed within a lens component as compared to when the search result is displayed outside the lens component. Instead, Kraft, *et al*. simply teaches putting back words of an abstract that the "zoom" function initially removed as undesirable. (*See* p. 3, ¶¶ [0027]-[0030]; p. 4, ¶ [0040]).

In addition, Kraft, *et al*. fails to teach magnifying or enlarging the size of content associated with a search result within a lens area, as compared to search results displayed outside the lens area. While Kraft, *et al*. refers to "zooming", the term "zoom"' is used in the context of the level of content removal performed with regard to an abstract, and not to the size of the information being "zoomed" relative to other information that is not being "zoomed". (*See* p. 3, ¶ [0027]).

In contrast, the claimed subject matter can include a lens component that can comprise a defined area (*e.g.*, lens area) in an interface and can display information, such as search results. The information displayed within the lens area can be animated to enlarge in size (*e.g.,* magnify in size) as compared to information outside of the lens area, for example. Further, in one aspect, when a search result is displayed within the lens area, ***additional textual information*** can be inserted within the lens area, as compared to the amount of textual information that is displayed when the search result is outside the lens area, wherein the ***additional textual information*** can be ***selected from the search result for insertion*** with the information originally displayed within the lens area ***based in part on the query*** associated with a search result.

For example, a search result (and other search results) can be returned and a subset of information regarding the search result, such as a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) and/or a summary of the page associated with the search result, can be displayed in an interface, where the search result, with the subset of information, can be displayed outside the lens area. In accordance with an aspect, the claimed subject matter can facilitate pre-fetching the page (as well as other pages associated with the other search results) and extracting and/or selecting textual information (*e.g.,* query-relevant textual information) regarding the search result that can be utilized for insertion within the lens area, as desired. When the lens area is placed over the search area, or when the search

result is otherwise within the lens area, additional textual information, which can be query-relevant textual information, can be retrieved and inserted within the lens area.

By employing animation of text and/or content insertion with regard to a search result within the lens area, the claimed subject matter can allow a user to more easily review information associated with the search result when within the lens area, while providing a de-emphasized view of other information outside of the lens area. The de-emphasis of search results outside the lens area can allow more search results to be displayed in the interface in order to minimize the need for scrolling and other actions when multiple search results are obtained from a query, for example.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Doyle, *et al.* and Kraft, *et al.* fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed subject matter as recited in independent claim 1, 20, 21, and 25 (and associated dependent claims 2-6, 10, 12, 15-19, 22-24, 26, and 27). Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 7-9 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doyle, *et al.* in view of Kraft, *et al.* and further in view of Card, *et al.* (US 2002/0083101). It is requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Doyle, *et al.*, Kraft, *et al.*, and Card, *et al.*, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the subject claims.

Claims 7-9 depend from independent claim 1. Card, *et al.* fails to cure the deficiencies of Doyle, *et al.* and Kraft, *et al.* with respect to independent claim 1. Rather, Card, *et al.* relates to systems and computer program products for improving the ability of users to interact with electronic documents. (*See* p. 2, ¶ [0016]). In view of at least the foregoing alone, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Further, claim 7 recites: ***the lens component is defined as a fisheye lens that is applied vertically to a display at about a focal center of the display***. Doyle, *et al.*, Kraft, *et al.*, and Card, *et al.*, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest this distinctive feature of the claimed subject matter.

The Examiner concedes that Doyle, *et al.* and Kraft, *et al.* do not disclose the claimed subject matter as recited in claim 7. (*See* Office Action, dated August 23, 2007,

p. 13, ¶ 5). However, the Examiner contends that Card, *et al.* teaches "the lens component is defined as a fisheye lens that is applied vertically to a display at about a focal center of the display." (*Id.*) Applicants' representative respectfully submits that the Examiner's contention that Card, *et al.* teaches the claimed subject matter is erroneous.

Rather, Card, *et al.* simply discloses utilizing a fisheye lens algorithm to calculate a degree of interest of a given object. (*See* p. 5, ¶¶ [0079]-[0080]). Card, *et al.* further discloses that the fisheye lens algorithm contains an intrinsic degree of interest function and a distance-based degree of interest function. (*See* p. 5, ¶ [0080]). However, unlike the claimed subject matter, Card, *et al.* fails to disclose a fisheye lens that is ***applied vertically to a display at about a focal center of the display***.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Doyle, *et al.*, Kraft, *et al.* and Card, *et al.*, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the claimed subject matter as recited in claim 7 (and claims 8 and 9 that depend therefrom). Accordingly, it is believed that the subject claims are in condition for allowance, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claim 13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doyle, *et al.* in view of Kraft, *et al.* and further in view of Wolton, *et al.* (US 2004/0030741). It is requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Claim 13 depends from independent claim 1. Wolton, *et al.* fails to cure the deficiencies of Doyle, *et al.* and Kraft, *et al.* with respect to independent claim 1. Rather, Wolton, *et al.* relates to a tool for creating intelligent information management applications in the form of specialized search and retrieval agents. (*See* p. 3, ¶ [0048]). Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn

V. Rejection of Claim 14 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doyle, *et al.* in view of Kraft, *et al.* and further in view of Montague (US 2005/0168488). It is requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Doyle, *et al.*, Kraft, *et al.* and Montague, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or

suggest each and every element of the claimed subject matter. Claim 14 depends from independent claim 1. Montague fails to cure the deficiencies of Doyle, *et al.* and Kraft, *et al.* with respect to independent claim 1. Rather, Montague relates to methods of combining user interfaces, such as zooming in/out, panning, rotating, drawing, selecting, and manipulating during a drag by a mouse for a graphics display. (*See* p. 1, ¶ [0004]). In view of at least the foregoing alone, the rejection should be withdrawn.

VI. Rejection of Claim 18 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doyle, *et al.* in view of Kraft, *et al.* and further in view of Szabo (US 2007/0156677). It is requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Doyle, *et al.*, Kraft, *et al.* and Szabo, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the claimed subject matter. Claim 18 depends from independent claim 1. Szabo fails to cure the deficiencies of Doyle, *et al.* and Kraft, *et al.* with respect to independent claim 1. Rather, Szabo relates to a user interface wherein the user may "hover" to trigger a change in display rather than requiring a mouse click. (*See* p. 41, ¶ [0349]). In view of at least the foregoing alone, the rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063[MSFTP607US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731